

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant hereby amends claims 1 and 16 to include features analogous to the features recited in claim 4, and cancels claim 4 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-19 are all of the claims pending in the application.

I. Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for a courteous telephonic interview on July 16, 2009. The PTO-413 requires Applicant to file a Statement of Substance of Interview. The Statement of Substance of Interview is as follows:

The telephonic interview was conducted on July 16, 2009, with the following in attendance:

Jean D. Saint Cyr (Examiner)

Eric S. Barr (Reg. No. 60,150)

Brian Pendleton (Supervisory Examiner)

Applicant discussed the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 4 with the Examiner and Supervisory Examiner. Applicant discussed differences between claim 4 and the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 5,950,111 to Georger et al. (hereinafter “Georger”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,150,896 to Decramer et al. (hereinafter “Decramer”).

The Supervisory Examiner agreed that claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Georger and Decramer, at least for the reasons presented in the Response filed on December 5, 2008.

The Supervisory Examiner suggested filing an Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in which independent claim 1 is amended to include the features of dependent claim 4, and the Supervisory Examiner further indicated that filing a Request for Continued Examination would

be unnecessary. Applicant hereby amends claim 1 to recite features analogous to the features of dependent claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Georger and Decramer.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-9, 13, 15, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georger in view of Decramer. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georger in view of Decramer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,427 to Rutledge et al. (hereinafter “Rutledge”). Claims 11, 12, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georger in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,340 to Flickinger et al. (hereinafter “Flickinger”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections at least in view of the following comments.

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “the first input processing unit (1) comprises means of cutting off (16) the signal transmission in the case in which a coaxial cable (53) is not connected to the coaxial output terminal (31) of the second output processing unit (3).” Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Georger and Decramer fails to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Georger fails to disclose the claimed cutting off means. Instead, Georger discloses a terminating means, which a person of ordinary skill in the

art would understand to be very different from the claimed cutting off means. The claimed cutting off means cuts the signal at the first input processing unit, whereas the terminating means 30 according to Georger terminates the output, *i.e.*, loads the loop between 4 and 5 (*see* FIG. 5 of Georger).

Secondly, the terminating means according to Georger is not located in the splitting means (alleged first input processing unit). Thirdly, Georger does not disclose any coaxial output terminal. Fourthly, according to Georger, the terminating means does not cut off the signal at the splitter.

The combination of Decramer with Georger fails to cure these deficiencies. At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Georger and Decramer.

Independent claims 15 and 16 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over Georger and Decramer at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, 5-9, 13, and 19 are patentable over Georger and Decramer at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 16.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12, 14, 17, and 18 are patentable over Georger and Decramer at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 16, as discussed above. The disclosure of Rutledge and Flickinger does not cure the deficiencies of Georger and Decramer as discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 16. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over Georger in view of Decramer and

Rutledge and that claims 11, 12, 14, 17, and 18 are patentable over Georger in view of Flickinger.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot with respect to claim 4, which is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric S. Barr/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Eric S. Barr
Registration No. 60,150

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 20, 2009